UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,968	08/26/2005	Jan Vermehren	514413-3951	8472

7590 03/21/2008

William F Lawrence
Frommer Lawrence & Haug
745 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10151

EXAMINER	
BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1624	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/511,968	VERMEHREN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	/Venkataraman Balasubramanian/	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 December 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *9-17* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/20/2004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-8 in the reply filed on 12/26/2007 is acknowledged. Claims 9-17 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected subject matter.

The traversal is on the ground(s) that the processes of Group I through Group V share the same inventive concept. This is not found persuasive.

First of all, contrary to applicants' urging, PCT application entering the national stage need not be examined as done in the PCT stage and lack of unity not asserted in the PCT is not a valid argument. US applications are examined according the rules set forth in MPEP.

Secondly, applicants' assertion all the above said Groups share the same inventive concept is incorrect. As noted in the restriction requirement each of the process of Group I through IV relate to making different compounds. It cannot be said the process of Group I, namely the process parameters leading to making compound of formula I share the same inventive concept for making compound of formula II, IIa or III embraced in the Groups II-IV. Group I and Group V are again have different inventive step and cannot deemed as sharing the same inventive concept.

Finally, applicants have not shown for the record that all these groups are equivalent. The art applied to one process as indicated in the restriction requirement could be applied to rest of the Groups.

Base on these facts, the restriction requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Information Disclosure Statement

References cited in the Information Disclosure Statement, filed on 10/20/2004, are made of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. Recitation of "a solvated(stabilized) derivative thereof" in step b2 renders claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-8 indefinite as it is not clear what this derivative is. The structural make-up of this derivative remains unknown and the process step b2 is unclear.

2. Regarding claim I, the phrase "preferably" renders claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-8 indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

3. Claim 3 is indefinite as it recites "compounds" of formula II and "compounds" of formula IIa. As recited, the term "compounds" implies a mixture of compounds used for the said process. Its replacement with "compound" is suggested.

4. Claim 8 is indefinite as it is not clear what is intended by an N-heteroaromatic compound.

In addition, claim 8 is an improper claim as it fails to further limit claim 7 on which it is dependent. Note there is no N-heteroaromatic compound in claim 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermehren et al., DE 199 463 41 (equivalent US 7,026,477) in view Stubbs, American Chemical Journal, 50, 193-204, 1913.

Vermehren et al. teaches several sulfonylurea compounds and the process of making which includes instant compounds and related process. See entire document. Especially page 4 for various steps in the process of making. Note these steps are also included in the instant claims and the genus of compounds overlap.

Vermehren et al., differs in not teaching the step a of instant process which require reaction of acid halide with RQH to esters.

Stubbs et al., teaches this step. See entire document. Especially see page 203.

Thus, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made would have been motivated to combine both the primary and secondary references and employ the process taught by these prior art to the starting materials and reactants of the instant invention and expect to obtain the desired product because he would have expected the analogous starting materials and reactants react similarly in view of the combine teaching of the prior art. It has been held that application of an old process to an analogous material to obtain a result consistent with the teachings of the art would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill. Note In re Kerkhoven 205 USPQ 1069.

See KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S.Ct. 1727 (2007), wherein the court stated that

[w]hen there is a design need or market pressure to solve a problem and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense.

Such is the case with instant claims. Vermehren et al. teaches all the essential steps of the over all process and conversion of acid halide to an ester as taught in Stubbs , a only step not taught by Vermehren. But it would be obvious to one trained in the art to find suitable process for making staring ester compounds and in light of such a positive teaching of Stubbs on would be motivated to combine these two references to arrive at the instant process.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-8 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 7,026,477 in view of Stubbs et al., American Chemical Journal, 50, 193-204, 1913 . As noted in above 103 rejection, the US equivalent of DE 199 46341 teaches the over process except the step a of instant claims. The secondary reference teaches process of step a. Thus, Thus, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made would have been motivated to combine both the primary and secondary references and employ the process taught by these prior art to the starting materials and reactants of the instant invention and expect to obtain the desired product because he would have expected the analogous starting materials and reactants react similarly in view of the combine teaching of the prior art. It has been held that application of an old process to an analogous material to obtain a result consistent with the teachings of the art would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill. Note In re Kerkhoven 205 USPQ 1069. See KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S.Ct. 1727 (2007).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

/Venkataraman Balasubramanian/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1624